

October 27, 1969

E 8909

feet. In asking for this added length, the truckers are getting grabby.

"ONLY PERMISSIVE"

Proponents of the bill emphasize that the bill is "only permissive"—no state would have to approve the higher limits; and they point out that the new dimensions would apply to the interstate highways only. The answer to this is, "huh-huh, or who's kidding whom? Once the higher limits were authorized, the truckers' lobby would roll into high gear; few legislatures would resist. And, as spokesmen for counties and cities have observed, the new behemoth trucks would have to get on and come off the interstate system by way of old highways and bridges not meant for the mastodon size.

The truckers say that larger trucks will produce economies in freight expenses, which economies in turn will be passed along to consumers. It seems doubtful. Consumers have not seen many such economies lately. The truth is that this bill would benefit truck and bus companies. Okay, but let's leave it at that.

Substantially this same bill passed the Senate last year, but died in the House when the 90th Congress ran out of time. On balance, the better arguments still lie against the bill. Unless a reasonable compromise can be found, the resurrected measure ought to be interred again.

(From the Boston Herald Traveler, Aug. 27, 1969)

LOAD LIMITS DO NOT EXCEED

When Congress reconvenes next week it will face more prospective legislation calling for increased limits in size and weight of tractor-trailer combinations permitted to travel the interstate highway system.

Congress will be asked to approve a vehicle length limit of 70 feet (most states allow 65 feet or less), increase allowable width from 96 to 102 inches, single-axle weight from 18,000 to 20,000 pounds and tandem-axle weight from 32,000 to 34,000 pounds.

Spokesmen for trucking associations and some users claim that the additional cargo allowances would impose no greater stress on existing highways or bridges, would enhance vehicle safety, would enable up to 10 per cent savings on consumer commodities and would afford truckers a more equitable return on their road-use taxes.

According to numerous studies, there is little if any truth to these claims. The Bureau of Public Roads reports that a 20,000-lb. axle weight causes 51 per cent more pavement deterioration than an 18,000-lb. one; and a 22,000-lb. axle weight (still under the Massachusetts limit) causes 118 per cent more wear than a 20,000-lb. one. Also, the Bureau indicates most of the country's half-a-million bridges would require reinforcement to take the increased poundage safely.

As for vehicle safety, American Automobile Association surveys reveal that heavy trucks—over 13 tons—are involved in a disproportionately large share of fatal accidents, and that in collisions with passenger cars, occupants of the latter are far more liable to suffer grievous injury or death.

Concerning transportation costs, it would be naively optimistic to assume that a 10 per cent saving would be passed intact to the consumer; such economy would in any case be erased by increased costs of highway reconstruction and maintenance, for even the higher road-use taxes currently paid by trucks do not offset the accelerated deterioration they cause.

The proposed legislation serves only special interests, not the public interest, and Congress should reject it on those grounds. Locally, the Massachusetts legislature would do its constituency a service to consider retrenchment of heavy-truck limitations along current federal lines.

CONGRESSIONAL DUTY TO KEEP COUNTRY MILITARILY STRONG

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 27, 1969

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the current debate over defense spending, and at what level our defenses should be, has unfortunately generated in many instances more heat than light. Not only the military, but the Congress itself, has come under heavy and frequently unfair and prejudiced attack.

The following article by Mr. John R. Blandford, chief counsel of the House Committee on Armed Services, appeared in the October 1969 issue of Government Executive. As Russ Blandford makes the point, it is the duty of Congress to keep the country strong:

A CONGRESSIONAL REQUIREMENT: TO KEEP AMERICA MILITARILY STRONG

HIGHLIGHTS

1—Soviets could substantially surpass the U.S. in the number of ICBM launchers by 1972.

2—Three Soviet ballistic-missile submarines are on station 800 to 1,000 miles off the U.S. coast.

3—The Soviet Navy is strengthening quantumly as the U.S. Navy weakens with age and small ship construction authorizations.

4—Section 412 of the Military Construction Act of 1959 and its amendments insures that more members of Congress are knowledgeable about weapon systems procurement.

5—"Congress may have to revert to the days when it operated only with ad hoc committees or as a Committee of the Whole, with no legislative committees with jurisdiction created by law."

6—"Very little is said about the fact that other agencies of the Federal Government have increased their expenditures during 1964-70 by over \$47 billion."

7—"The scapegoat of the year is the military-industrial complex."

8—"The Systems Analysis Office still exists in the Department of Defense, although there is reason to believe, or perhaps hope is a better expression, that to some extent the wings of the analysts have been clipped."

9—"In discussing cost overruns, some non-military Federal projects make interesting reading."

10—"The chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, L. Mendel Rivers of South Carolina, is accused of having an inordinate number of military facilities and defense contractors in his district."

(By John R. Blandford)

In the furor of debate over the *Safeguard* system and the size of the Defense budget, little attention was paid to a stark statement in the Soviet Armed Forces Communist Party Journal *Kommunist Vooruzhennikh Sil* that it is mandatory for young recruits in the Soviet armed forces to be educated in "hatred for the enemy and the enemy is led by the United States."

A recent article declares that Russia not only is closing the ICBM gap, but by 1972 could substantially surpass the United States in the number of intercontinental ballistic missile launchers. The charge has not been refuted. Some even claim the Soviets already have an ICBM superiority.

The published report on "Soviet Sea Power," by the Center for Strategic and International Studies, states categorically: "The new Soviet Navy is the most modern in the world—a very large percentage of the ships afloat being less than 20 years old. The sub-

marine fleet is the world's largest, consisting of between 350 and 385 ships, of which more than 100 are missile-armed. Forty to 45 are nuclear-powered and, since 1962, Soviet submarines have been able to fire ballistic missiles while submerged. The USSR is presently developing a *Polaris*-type submarine with 16 missiles and a present range of 1,500 miles. Shipbuilding yards in the USSR have a present capacity to build one of these SSBNs a month, and the number of USSR submarine-based ballistic missiles could surpass the U.S. total by 1971. Already, the USSR keeps three ballistic missile submarines cruising on station 800 to 1,000 miles off the U.S. coast, a number which could increase rapidly as the Soviets improve their on-station replenishment and supply system.

"The Soviet surface fleet consists of two helicopter carriers, two to 24 cruisers, 110 to 120 destroyers and frigates, 92 ocean-going escorts, about 150 missile-armed patrol boats, 400 fast patrol boats, 270 coastal escorts, 250 or more landing ships and a large assortment of mine sweepers, as well as support and auxiliary vessels; these vessels, along with the submarines, are distributed in five fleets—totaling about 3,000 ships—in the oceans of the world. Warsaw Pact navies add to the potential strength of the Soviet fleets."

In contrast to the strength of the growing Soviet Navy, 58 percent of the combatant fleet of the U.S. Navy is over 20 years old.

But these frightening challenges to the survival of our Nation have been obscured by an attack, wittingly or unwittingly, upon the so-called U.S. military-industrial complex and military expenditures.

As former Secretary of State Dean Acheson succinctly stated: "One of our failings as people, I think, is a preoccupation with witches . . . the witch has changed and is now the military-industrial complex."

It has become very unpopular to defend our military. And those committees of Congress charged with the responsibility for legislation dealing with our national defense are under increasing attack, both within the Congress and by all forms of news media.

The underlying cause is undoubtedly the frustration many Americans feel with respect to the war in Vietnam. But the debate over defense spending, overruns, revised estimates and the procurement of weapon systems overlooks the genesis of the authorization process which has made it possible for Congress to become more fully informed with respect to defense spending over the past eight years than ever before.

Prior to 1960, the great *Safeguard* debate might never have taken place or it might have been swallowed up by the magnitude of the entire defense budget. In 1959, the Congress amended Section 412 of the Military Construction Act of 1959 by providing that "no funds may be appropriated after December 31, 1960, to or for the use of any armed force of the United States for the procurement of aircraft, missiles or naval vessels unless the appropriation of such funds has been authorized by legislation enacted after such date."

Thus, since the beginning of 1961, two legislative committees of the Congress, specifically the House and Senate Armed Services Committees have authorized all major weapon systems before funds could be appropriated for such systems.

In 1962, the Congress amended the new authorization procedures by adding research, development, test and evaluation with respect to aircraft, missiles and Naval vessels.

In 1963, the law was further amended to include all research, development test and evaluation performed by the armed services.

In 1965, the law again was amended to include all tracked combat vehicles. It is not unlikely that the law may be further amended to include other major procurement expenditures.

The so-called "412" legislation, since 1961, has controlled authorization bills (and result-

ant expenditures) in sums ranging from \$13 billion to \$23 billion annually. By this action alone, many additional members of Congress have become increasingly knowledgeable about the weapon systems to be procured, their use, their cost and the process by which they are to be procured.

Prior to "412," only the Appropriations Committees were fully informed, except for information gleaned from posture briefings presented to legislative committees for information purposes only.

DISAPPEARING MYSTIQUE

But now, the Congress no longer simply appropriates money in large "blank checks" for use by the armed services as they see fit. Specific sums are requested for aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, tracked combat vehicles and all research and development. During the classified hearings, so-called "below the line items" which make up the total lump sum requested for the major procurement items are presented to the Appropriations Committee.

The services may not later deviate from the numbers authorized by the Committees without prior approval of the appropriate committees, or without notifying the appropriate committees of their intention to do so. This procedure is called "reprogramming" and is the process by which the services may change up or down the number of weapon systems to be procured by using funds authorized and appropriated for other items in the defense budget. It is carefully supervised and controlled.

Thus, in a period of eight years the mystique of defense spending has been slowly disappearing. There still are large expenditures which are not specifically authorized by the Congress annually for such things as ammunition, small arms, artillery, petroleum, uniforms, food and other military necessities. Nevertheless, the House and Senate Armed Services Committees have, with each passing year, delved more deeply into defense expenditures.

Study groups and task forces have been created in and out of the Congress to study the defense budget. It is not unlikely that several nongovernment organizations or groups may take it upon themselves to present independent defense budgets each year. This may well lead to similar study groups or task forces being created within the Congress—although not necessarily associated with the jurisdictional committees—to look into parity prices, foreign affairs, poverty programs, public works, Medicare, veterans benefits and many other matters involving substantial Federal expenditures. If this is carried to its logical extreme, the Congress may have to revert to the days when it operated only with ad hoc committees or as a Committee of the Whole, with no legislative committees with jurisdiction created by law. Whether this would be a healthy move is debatable, but the trend today might make it inevitable.

SPENDING ANALYZED

The present attack upon the standing committees of the Congress charged with the responsibility for writing the laws and authorization bills dealing with national defense (Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946) could well lead to a complete upheaval in the legislative process.

Defense spending is the target—or, perhaps, the committee system itself is under attack.

To the uninformed or to those dead set on reducing defense expenditures, regardless of the consequences, it might be well to analyze defense spending.

In spite of the size of the defense budget, defense spending, as presented by the present Administration for Fiscal Year 1970, is estimated at approximately \$78 billion. This is an astronomical sum, but it only represents

about eight percent of the Gross National Product.

In relation to the Federal budget, recommended defense spending amounts to approximately 39 percent of Fiscal Year 1970, compared to 42.5 percent in 1968, 41.8 percent in 1964 and 62 percent in 1953.

THE SCAPEGOAT

It also is interesting to note that from 1964 to 1970 defense expenditures have increased by \$27 billion, which by itself may have led to the overdone and out-of-context military-industrial complex charge. Very little is said about the fact that the other agencies of the Federal Government have increased their expenditures during this same time period by over \$47 billion.

Nor is that other part of President Eisenhower's now famous military-industrial complex address quoted very often in which he said: "We face a hostile ideology—global in scope, atheistic in character, ruthless in purpose and insidious in method. Unhappily the danger it poses promises to be of indefinite duration. . . . A vital element in keeping the peace is our military establishment. Our arms must be mighty, ready for instant action, so that no potential aggressor may be tempted to risk his own destruction."

Those who decry the military-industrial complex never refer to the fact that from Fiscal Year 1968 to Fiscal Year 1970 defense expenditures declined by \$100 million, while other agencies of the Government increased their expenditures by \$12.4 billion.

So the scapegoat of the year is the military industrial complex. But, those who attack it seldom if ever mention that more than half of the defense budget involves fixed charges that can only be reduced by drastically cutting back the size of the armed forces.

More than half of the defense budget, some \$41 billion annually, is spent on people, including pay, allowances, transportation, retired pay and other costs which involve the procurement of no material things.

As Secretary of Defense Laird has said on many occasions, we spend over \$41 billion annually, none of which buys a paint brush, a nail or a bullet.

PHILOSOPHY OF PARITY

Other parts of the defense budget involving operation and maintenance costs—including the cost of ammunition, fuel and the war in Southeast Asia—account for half the remainder, leaving about 25 percent of the defense budget for the procurement of weapon systems.

The House Committee on Armed Services is most conscious of this fact. When efforts are made to bring about reductions in defense spending, there are really only three areas subject to paring: the cost of the war in Vietnam, the cost of people and the cost for new weapon systems. And since new weapon systems, in most cases, replace aircraft and ships that simply wear out or are lost in operational or combat missions, it is significant to point out that our inventory of aircraft, ships, spares, guns, etc., is not increasing and, in some cases, is actually declining.

Even a substantial reduction in the size of the armed forces, for example, a reduction of approximately one million persons on active duty, would only reduce spending for people by some \$8 billion annually. And if an all-volunteer force is the desire of the American people, then the \$8 billion savings would be offset by the pay increases necessary to attain an all-volunteer force.

The House Committee on Armed Services looked for areas in which expenditures could be deferred for Fiscal Year 1970. One area was in the field of military construction. And here the Committee did defer programs.

Another area is in the field of research and development. But cuts here pose a more difficult problem. The Committee on Armed Services cannot ignore the fact that substantial cuts in research and development may lead to serious weapons gaps in the years ahead.

There appears to be an abiding faith in the minds of some that if we do not devise new weapon systems, devastating as they may be, the Soviet Union or Communist China will be happy to maintain a state of parity with us. Somewhere along the line, in the past few years, the philosophy of parity, as opposed to the philosophy of superiority, in the defense of the Nation, has crept into many decisions affecting our security.

But these members of the Committee on Armed Services who must deal daily with orders of battle, are not at ease when they realize that the Soviet Union has 350 submarines, as opposed to our 146. The Committee on Armed Services of the House is not happy about the fact that the Soviet Union has 25 surface-to-surface missile ships—destroyers and cruisers—and we have none. And we are well aware of the fact that the Soviet Union has 150 missile patrol boats, while we have none. But there are some who feel that, since we have 18 attack carriers and the Soviets have none, we no longer need to build new carriers.

The Soviets have at least 13 new fighters, eight of them prototypes. Our newest operational fighter is the F-4, first flown in 1956. With the exception of the F-111, the United States does not have a new fighter in production now. This serious gap will be bridged in part by the production of the F-14 for the Navy and the F-15 for the Air Force.

SYSTEMS ANALYSIS

But there are or were those in the Department of Defense, particularly in the Office of Systems Analysis, who believe it is a mistake to build the F-14 and F-15, based on the theory that the aircraft are too expensive and that there is no need for such sophisticated weapon systems, with all-weather capability and highly accurate bombing devices. This philosophy is most mystifying. It seems to be based on an assumption that any war involving the use of fighter aircraft will be conducted in Europe, in lovely weather and in the daytime only.

The Systems Analysis Office still exists in the Department of Defense, although there is reason to believe, or perhaps hope is a better expression, that to some extent the wings of the analysts have been clipped.

Because of the experience with the C-5A and F-111 and the cancellation of the Navajo, the MOL and the B-70 and other expensive programs, there are those who believe that vast amounts of money have been wasted by the Department of Defense and, thus, by the Congress for not anticipating the problems encountered in these programs.

A study of any of those programs will reveal, however, that the technical gains to the Nation in many cases far exceeded the entire cost of the program, including cancellation costs. The present inertial guidance system came from the Navajo. New wing structures and new metals came from the B-70 program. Miniaturization and new control methods came from the MOL program.

The so-called overruns of the C-5A program became newspaper headlines until a clear analysis established that the costs overruns were not nearly as great as advertised. Inflation, over which neither the Government nor the contractor had any control, accounted for a large portion of the overruns. There were unanticipated engineering difficulties and these led to the "milestone" approach for the new defense procurement programs. (The "milestone" approach provides for a scheduled periodic review and decision-making point in the development of

a program to insure that the program is meeting quantity, cost and time factors.)

The "milestone" approach may also eliminate complex formulas for second runs, based upon the over-costs of the first runs. But there is hardly a defense program today that has not experienced some cost increase, simply because of the rising cost of living.

Those programs that are almost on target—such as the production of the Navy A-7E, the Air Force A-7D and the development of SAM-D by the Army—are not headline makers.

In discussing cost overruns, some non-military Federal projects make interesting reading.

The interstate highway system was originally estimated to cost \$27.6 billion. Today, the cost estimate is \$56.5 billion, a 104 percent increase. The Kennedy Cultural Center in Washington, D.C., was estimated to cost \$46.4 million. Its present estimated cost is \$66.4 million, a 46 percent cost overrun. The lunar module, in our space program, was estimated to cost \$388 million. Its current estimate is \$1.9 billion, a 389 percent increase. In 1958, Medicare costs were estimated to be \$3.79 billion. The present estimate is \$5.33 billion, a 40 percent increase.

These cost overruns are not particularly well advertised, but woe to the defense contractor who has to enter into a new field, for his cost overruns will be front page stories in the present atmosphere of downgrading the military and everything associated with it.

OTHER DISTRICTS VIEWED

The chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, L. Mendel Rivers of South Carolina, is accused of having an inordinate number of military facilities and defense contractors in his district. As of June 30, 1968, there were in Chairman Rivers' district 11,300 active duty military personnel and 14,790 civilian employees. The military payroll was \$83 million annually and the Federal civilian payroll was \$123 million annually. Prime contract awards involved \$1 million in Fiscal Year 1968.

Let's look at eight other areas of the country during this same period:

San Antonio, Texas, had 53,000 active duty military personnel and 38,000 civilian employees. The estimated payroll for Fiscal Year 1969 was \$284 million annually for military personnel and \$324 million annually for the Federal civilian employees. Prime contract awards in San Antonio in Fiscal Year 1968 amounted to \$96 million.

The Atlanta, Ga., area, had 50,000 active duty military personnel and 14,000 civilian employees. The payroll of the military involved \$250 million annually and the payroll for Federal civilian employees was over \$122 million. The Atlanta area had \$775 million worth of prime contract awards in Fiscal Year 1968.

The Pensacola, Fla., area had over 33,000 active duty military personnel and 14,000 Federal civilian employees. The military payroll is over \$205 million and the payroll for Federal civilian employees exceeds \$123 million annually. There were over \$66 million in prime contract awards in Fiscal Year 1968 in the Pensacola area.

The Chicago area, including Great Lakes, had 35,000 military personnel on active duty and over 6,000 civilian employees. The military payroll is \$159 million and the civilian payroll exceeds \$48 million annually. There were \$38 million in prime contract awards made in Fiscal Year 1968.

San Diego had over 95,000 military personnel and more than 24,000 civilians. The payroll for the military exceeded \$401 million and the civilian payroll was over \$229 million. Prime contract awards in Fiscal Year 1968 involving defense matters exceeded \$391 million.

The Bremerton-Seattle-Tacoma area in the State of Washington had over 53,000 active duty military personnel and more than 24,000 civilian employees. The military payroll exceeded \$259 million and the civilian payroll exceeded \$218 million. Prime contract awards in Fiscal Year 1968 exceeded \$470 million.

Fort Rucker in Alabama had 11,555 active duty military personnel and 3,205 civilian employees. The military payroll exceeds \$68 million annually and the Federal civilian payroll exceeds \$24 million annually. In 1968 there were over \$37 million in prime contract awards.

The Norfolk-Portsmouth area of Virginia had more than 21,000 military personnel and nearly 35,000 civilians employed. The military payroll is almost \$94 million annually and the civilian payroll is in excess of \$271 million. Prime contract awards amounted to \$68 million in Fiscal Year 1968.

But, depending upon which newspaper one reads, it would be easy to conclude that the vast bulk of defense spending is in the Charleston, S.C., area. The newspaper attacks made upon the House Armed Services Committee and some of its members make prophetic those words of Alexis de Tocqueville: "In order to enjoy the inestimable benefits that the liberty of the press ensures, it is necessary to submit to the inevitable evils that it creates."

And—sadly enough—defense spending and the much maligned military-industrial complex are not the only targets of those who would take over the functions of the Bureau of the Budget, the Department of Defense and the House and Senate Armed Services Committees.

MILITARY DISCIPLINE

From press reports and the *Congressional Record*, one gains the impression that the Nation is completely disenchanted with the present Selective Service System. Strangely enough, public opinion polls and the lack of complaints from those most vitally affected—the inductees—do not substantiate the charge of disenchantment. (This, however, should sound familiar, since the public opinion polls with respect to the ABM system throughout the Nation are almost universally two-to-one in support of the ABM system, notwithstanding the close vote in the Senate.)

And then there is the Uniform Code of Military Justice, which applies to our armed forces. It was written under the mandate of Article I, Section 8, of the Constitution, but is a favorite target for many courts, not excepting the Supreme Court. Perhaps discipline is not vital to a military organization, but no one has suggested a better alternative.

And in attempting to maintain discipline, the military must also assure justice. The two do not always coincide.

Perhaps the Constitutional rights so many Americans have fought so hard to preserve are now being very cleverly exploited to destroy us.

Only time will tell, but the United States of America cannot indulge the luxury of defeat, with the hope that her conquerors will be as generous as we have been to those we have defeated.

One thing is certain: So long as the present senior members of both the House and Senate Armed Services Committees are in the Congress, President George Washington's advice that "to be prepared for war is one of the most effectual means of preserving peace" will continue to be their watchword.

H.R. 5582

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 27, 1969

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include my statement on H.R. 5582 which

would permit three additional judges for the southern district of California, which I am cosponsoring:

STATEMENT BY MR. UTT ON H.R. 5582

Mr. Chairman, I am a cosponsor of H.R. 5582 which would permit three additional judges for the Southern District of California, one of the fastest growing areas in the world.

Fast growth is always accompanied by problems of a legal nature, both criminal and civil, and Southern California is no exception. The two active judges now permanently assigned to this District are carrying a caseload, which in 1967, was 826 per judge as compared with the national average of 252.

Indicative of the growth of cases, in 1968 there were approximately 2,500 criminal cases filed in the District as compared with 2,094 in 1967. This heavy load requires that civil cases drag on interminably, with only a handful being processed annually. The problem is mitigated somewhat by the use of one and sometimes two visiting judges, but they seldom handle pleas, arraignments, pretrials, or motions.

Crime is on the increase throughout the nation, and it can only be helped to prosper when criminals fail to get quick and sure punishment for their transgressions. This is impossible when there is a shortage of judges in an area.

The Chief Judge of the District stated that "we are in desperate straits," and no more urgent plea can be made for the approval of this legislation at the earliest possible date.

CONGRESSMAN CARL ALBERT INVITES ATTENTION TO THE REMARKABLY FINE CONTRIBUTION OF GREEN THUMB, INC., TO IMPROVEMENT IN THE ECONOMIC STATUS OF ELDERLY CITIZENS IN RURAL AMERICA

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 27, 1969

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I have had occasion to visit the locations of projects in my home State by which Green Thumb, Inc., has brought increased income and new hope to elderly men in Oklahoma. I have read of its splendid work in other States.

On October 12 of this year there appeared in Oklahoma Ranch and Farm World an excellent and informative article concerning the work of Green Thumb in the State of Oklahoma. At this time I am presenting this article for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that all interested persons may learn what is being done by the National Farmers Union in cooperation with the Labor Department and local community action programs to advance the cause of elderly people in our rural communities. The article is as follows:

GREEN THUMB

(By Herb Karner)

"Green Thumb" may mean an extra amount of gardening skill to some, but to a growing army of old men, it means much more. It means a chance to retain the dignity of work; a chance to earn a half-way decent living in declining years; it means a way of avoiding the stigma of "welfare" and it means a chance to contribute something worthwhile to society.

What is "Green Thumb"? It's a program dreamed up and fought for, and now admin-

October 27, 1969

istered by, the National Farmers Union in cooperation with the Labor Department and local Community Action Programs (CAP) which in turn is part of the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO).

Green Thumb would never have become a reality had it not been for leaders of National Farmers Union who fight battles of small farmers. They became enraged when they stood by and watched what was happening to old farmers, and launched a battle for their survival.

It's not an expensive program as most such self-help projects go. The amount of federal money is a pittance compared to others. But it does help and that's the big objective of NFU—helping old farmers.

Green Thumb provides supplemental income for needy rural residents with agricultural backgrounds. Originally Green Thumb workers were assigned to highway beautification projects but these activities have been extended to the development of roadside and community parks, landscape around public buildings and hospitals and emergency activities such as assisting school districts.

In the Southwest, Green Thumb has been most active in Arkansas, but is now being implemented in seven Oklahoma counties where needs are greatest. Oklahoma's program is headed by Chester Stone, staff member of the Oklahoma Farmers Union at Oklahoma City.

Nationally the project was given the green light in January of 1966 with funds provided by OEO through the Department of Labor.

Five Arkansas counties were selected to try the experiment. Pike, Cleveland, Fulton, Madison and Newton. More than half of the residents in these counties were far below the poverty income level. Lewis J. Johnson, Jr., is director of the program for the Arkansas Farmers Union; and Dr. Blue Carstensen, of the National Farmers Union Washington Office, is national director.

Since the beginning in Arkansas, not only has the program spread to other counties, 14 states have adopted Green Thumb. They are besides Oklahoma and Arkansas, Indiana, Kentucky, Minnesota, Nebraska, New Jersey, New York, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Utah, Virginia, and Wisconsin.

This year there will be more than 2,000 Green Thumbs doing gainful work. They'll average about 68 years old, and—get this—their average yearly income per couple averaged around \$900, before getting Green Thumb work. The general criteria for Green Thumb jobs was to need supplemental income; be past 60 and be able to do outdoor work. Coal of Green Thumb leaders is to give old men an opportunity to earn up to \$1,500 a year additional income. Green Thumbs earn the federal minimum wage of \$1.60 an hour and work eight hours a day, but are limited to three days work weekly.

How's it working? The year the program began it provided work for about 140 men. In 1967 it was expanded to include 11 counties in Arkansas and employed about 236. Last year 537 were employed in 31 counties and it is hoped to include 35 counties with more than 600 working in Arkansas, according to Johnson.

Green Thumb started in Oklahoma last year and currently is active in Lincoln, Oklahoma, Sequoyah, Haskell and LeFlore counties. Helping Stone as state supervisor, is Ronald Ragland who is field supervisor for the eastern part of the state.

Sooners who work on the project also must be older than 60 and follow the same regulations.

"We want to spread the funds as far as possible," Stone said. "To be eligible a person's income must be under \$3,000 a year if he has a family, and below \$1,700 if he's single. He's got to have a farm background, and need a job."

Surprisingly, there's a waiting list for old men wanting work. They are not on welfare rolls. Some get small Social Security checks, but are victims of economic inflation. They cannot compete with younger men for jobs, but they still have skills, energy, know-how and desire to do a day's work for a day's pay.

While money is important, it isn't everything to the Green Thumb crew. Take the case of John McKinney. He's a 78-year-old retired farmer living in Sallisaw.

"I'm sure thankful for the Green Thumb program. Gives me a chance to get out in the country. After all, I spent my life with cows, mules and horses and growing things.

"Oh, I've got a garden in town—have a city lot, and a good garden. 'Course, it's kind burned out now, but a garden ain't the same as farming.

"Quit 'bout 10 years ago. Biggest mistake I ever made. Had about as good a 140 acre farm as you'd find, but my wife wanted to move to town, so I sold out and moved to town to please her.

"And, she's real well satisfied. But not me. Now, working three days a week gives me something to do beside sit in the house and stare at four walls," he said.

"Yessir. Never dreamed 10 years ago that land would get as high as it is . . . it was bringing around \$25 to \$30 an acre, and that's what I got for mine. But it didn't go far, and this extra I earn sure comes in handy," McKinney said.

Currently projects in Oklahoma involve city parks, and other municipal projects. Green Thumb officials work in cooperation with city officials who are in need of dependable labor, have the equipment and necessary funds for improvements. Green Thumb supplies the labor.

"Kinda like the old WPA days," one old-timer said who is working on the Vian City Park. "Back in them days we built a lot of things. Bridges, courthouses, roads—you name it, we built it. 'Made work' they called it, but by God, we at least gave 'em their money's worth."

And everyone concerned with Green Thumb today agrees that these old men—considered over the hill by society—are giving more than their money's worth to society.

"Without the assistance of the Green Thumb in the building of toilets, fireplaces, picnic tables, as well as the clearing of trees and brush burning, the development of these assets in Becker County (Minn.) would not have been possible, said Duane N. Winter, land commissioner.

And, Sister Mary Michael, administrator of the Eureka Springs Municipal Hospital at Eureka Springs, Ark., said "twice during the past year our hospital has benefitted by the work of the Green Thumb men. The first was a rock retaining wall along the street in front of the new wing. In December these good men transformed our dark, dingy basement in the old hospital building into a bright, clean sparkling place."

There's an added dividend. More than 100 Green Thumbs last year found jobs with other employers. Almost without exception what happens is this: The Green Thumb work proves to the world that age does not keep a person from doing a good job. But the most important thing is that it proves to the Green Thumb himself that he's not a "has-been." He finds out that he can still do a day's work. Sometimes this is the most important part.

Green Thumb officials are encouraging and helping Green Thumbs find employment with private employers. For one thing, they can usually earn more money on such jobs. For another thing, when they move out to a new job, they make room for another old man to take their place.

So keep your eyes open as you drive around Oklahoma and Arkansas. If you see an old man cheerfully working away, and if he's

wearing a shiny green hard hat, he's a member of a proud corps, the Green Thumb. Stop and get acquainted. He'll take time to tell you what he's doing, and how proud he is to be doing something worthwhile.

REFLECTIONS ON VIETNAM

HON. CATHERINE MAY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 27, 1969

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, a number of my colleagues know Robert W. Lucas, until recently assigned to the Washington press corps. Bob is a newspaperman of wide experience and I am happy to say is now executive director of the Yakima Herald-Republic in my hometown of Yakima, Wash.

Bob Lucas recently wrote an editorial entitled "Reflections on Vietnam." It is the finest piece of its kind and I, therefore, want to share it with my colleagues:

[From the Yakima Herald-Republic, Sept. 18, 1969]

REFLECTIONS ON VIETNAM

(By Robert W. Lucas)

It is not easy to write with fairness and balance about the war in Vietnam. The more one knows about it, its political origins, the dismal chronology of faulty assumptions and indecisive and senseless engagements—the heroism and sacrifice, the corruption and waste, the suffering and grief associated with it—the more difficult it becomes to judge the war coolly and responsibly. But this is an effort to do just that.

President Nixon continues to support the general hypothesis of his predecessor on the rationale of the war, although with significant modifications of strategy designed to end it. Both the Johnson and the Nixon administrations may be right in justifying their commitment of United States power in Asia. But I have never seen it that way and do not now.

Since 1965 and until this summer, I had unusual opportunities in Washington to follow the course of decisions on the prosecution of the war. As a White House correspondent, in constant and close contact with both columnists and reporters, and the highest officials of the government, I watched the policy struggles at close hand. And on occasion I was privileged to meet and talk informally and off-the-record with, among others, Walter W. Rostow, Cyrus Vance, Robert S. McNamara, Dean Rusk, Ellsworth Bunker, Vice President Humphrey and President Johnson himself.

With great respect for the sincerity, the depth of commitment and the exhausting labor of these men who were carrying the lawful burdens of the conflict, I concluded that they were often victims of events almost beyond their control. They were forced to grapple with an inexplicably confusing challenge to free world interests in old Indochina, and do so coincidental with the eruption of serious troubles at home. And this mix of cause and effect led them into the blind alley called Vietnam.

When the scholars and the historians have had time to analyze events of the late decade, this is what I believe they will find:

What started as a hopefully pragmatic, idealistic and even inspired effort to help those Vietnamese who, for political or religious reasons, attempted to remain outside Ho Chi Minh's Communist dictatorship in Hanoi, was transformed by our political

House Appropriations Chairman's Review

Your editorial of Dec. 11, "The Money Bills for Christmas," makes sharp reference to the delays in enactment of the appropriation bills, apportioning the blame among the administration and both houses of Congress. But the record will clearly show that the House Committee on Appropriations has not been the major stumbling block.

I agree with much of your editorial, but I must say that, in my judgment, it is not quite on the qualitative par of your editorial of Oct. 31, "Appropriations Logjam," which I thought was so perceptive and well balanced that I inserted it in the Congressional Record.

Even allowing for some extenuating circumstances—which you do—I would agree that neither the administration nor the House or Senate has done acceptably well in regard to processing the money business this year.

Next year, many of the delays inherent in setting up a new administration will not beset the executive team. This will be of inestimable value to Congress. Moreover, as chairman of the Appropriations Committee, working in cooperation with the leadership on both sides of the aisle, we have definite plans for doing a much more expeditious job.

Your editorial of Dec. 11 departs in a significant and, to me, disappointing way from the underlying assessment that blame for late appropriations can be shared generally by all those responsible for their processing. You say that much of the blame for this logjam belongs on the House side, the House leaders allowing "the managers of the money bills to amble along at their own pace instead of fixing a date for the reporting of each bill." I include a statement of the Majority Leader made on the floor of the House on Oct. 29, 1969:

Mr. Albert . . . Further, Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Mahon). Every year he has come in with a schedule or agenda of bills from his committee. He has followed it, I believe, as religiously as any committee in the House has been able to follow an agenda, and he has done an outstanding job. He has been thwarted time and time again by the lack of authorizations and by matters beyond his control . . .

I would be deeply grateful if you would print for your readers the following facts which seem the most pertinent, since they involve the six regular appropriation bills

still pending in Congress. You point out that "enactment of authorization bills must precede appropriations."

Taking the bills one by one, here is the record:

1. *Defense.* The underlying authorization bill passed the Senate Sept. 18; the House Oct. 3; cleared Congress Nov. 6; signed into law Nov. 19.

The Committee on Appropriations reported the appropriation bill Dec. 3; the House passed it Dec. 8. Now in Senate.

2. *Military Construction.* Authorization bill passed House Aug. 5; the Senate Nov. 11; cleared Congress Nov. 21; signed into law Dec. 5.

The Committee on Appropriations reported the appropriation bill Nov. 12; passed House Nov. 13; passed Senate Dec. 8. Now in conference.

3. *Foreign Assistance.* Authorization bill passed House Nov. 20; on Senate floor today (Dec. 12).

The Committee on Appropriations reported the appropriation bill on Dec. 8; the House passed it Dec. 9. Now in Senate.

4. *District of Columbia.* The D.C. revenue authorization bill passed the House Aug. 11; the Senate Oct. 13; cleared Congress Oct. 30; signed into law Oct. 31.

The Committee on Appropriations reported the appropriation bill Nov. 20; the House passed it Nov. 24; the Senate passed it Dec. 11. It is now in conference.

5. *Labor-HEW.* Despite absence of enacted authorization bills for the anti-poverty program and several other programs normally funded in this bill, the Committee on Appropriations reported this bill on July 24 and the House passed it on July 31. It is now in the Senate.

6. *Transportation.* When we reported this bill on Nov. 13 and passed it on Nov. 18, it was necessary to adopt a rule making it in order despite the lack of enacted authorization bills for the urban mass transportation and traffic and highway safety programs.

This bill is still pending in the Senate.

In closing, let me commend you for your generally fair and well intentioned statements on what is perhaps the most important single business of the Congress.

GEORGE MAHON,

Chairman, House Committee on Appropriations,
Washington.